

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1, and 3-8 are presently amended. Support for the amendment is found in originally filed application at least at pg. 3, lines 29-30 and pg. 1, line 36 to pg. 3, line 7 of the originally filed specification, and in original claims 1, and 3-8. Thus, no new matter is added.

II. Summary of Office Action dated May 11, 2010

Claims 1 and 5-8 are objected to because of various informalities. Claims 1-8 also are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

III. Response

Claim Objections

In response to the objections to claims 1 and 5-8, claims 1 and 5-8 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion to improve consistency between the claims and the specification. The equation in claim 5 has been corrected, and claims 5-8 have been amended to remove improper multiple dependent claims. Accordingly the grounds for the objection to claims 1 and 5-8 are overcome. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 1 and 5-8 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the first and second network of transducers each include a respective plurality of transducers. Further, claim 1 is amended to remove the "making it possible" and "much like" language.

Lastly, in response to the question posed in paragraph 3 of the detailed action, lines 3-8 of claim 1 have been amended to recite that the method comprises a learning step in which the signals $e_i(t)$, which are emitted by each transducer i of the first network in order to generate the predetermined objective wave field in the medium, are determined by transmitting waves in the medium between the first network and the second network. The claim then proceeds to recite limitations concerning the learning step. Ultimately, what is determined is the predetermined objective wave field, which may be used to produce an image, or any of the other useful applications as listed in the application specification at least at page 4, line 9 to page 5, line 11.

Accordingly, the grounds for rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are overcome. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and an early action so indicating is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 28944/40701, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

July 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
David C. Read

Registration No.: 39,811
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive
6300 Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicants